

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR 9 Intersection Improvement SR9/3rd St.

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	3.7	5.2

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-1	-3	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-3	-1.0	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.0	-3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	3	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	3.7	8.2

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

13.1

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR 9 Intersection Improvements, SR 9/6th Street

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	2.7	4.2

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-1	-.3	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-3	-1	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	-.3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	3	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	2.7	5.7

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

9.8

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Millcreek/McKennans Church Road

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	2	.7		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	2	3.7	

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	2.7	6.2	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**11.4**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Lockerman/Forest Street – Traffic Circle

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		3	1.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		5	2.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		15	5	9

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		-1	-.3	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		-1.3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		8	4	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		3	.7	4.7

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**12.4**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET
“RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Salem Church Road

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
 Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
 Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
 Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
 Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3.3		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
 Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
 Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
 Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
 Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
 Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
 Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
 Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
 Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
 Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	4		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**11.3**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET
“RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Foulk Road Improvements

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
 Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
 Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
 Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
 Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
 Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
 Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
 Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
 Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
 Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
 Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
 Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
 Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
 Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
 Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3.3		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**7.3**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET
“RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Possum Park Road

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1.5		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	1		
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3.3		
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**7.3**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET
“RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: I-95/202 Interchange - NB I-95 Ramp to NB 202 Widening

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	4		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			5.5

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7		7.3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	2		3.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

16.3

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Port of Wilmington - AutoPort

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	10	3.3	5.2

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	2.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**7.7**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Statewide Rail Feasibility Study

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	1.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	1

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**2.7**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Motor Vehicle Buyback Program

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	1.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	1

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**2.7**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Bridgeville Visitors Center

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	1

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0	0	2.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**3.5**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR16 from SR 1 to Broadkill Beach

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			1.5

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			1

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			1.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

4

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR 1/SR 8 Expanded Interchange, Dover

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			1.5

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-5	-2	-.7	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-3	-1		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	-.7	

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3.5	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

4.3

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Motor Vehicle On-Board Diagnostics

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		1.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor #9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**5.2**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR 273 and Quigley Boulevard Improvements

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			3

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	-5	0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			-1

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3.5	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**5.5**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Sussex County Aviation

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		0

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impact s</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	2.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**6.2**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET

“RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Shellpot Rail Bridge

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5	
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		1.5

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7	4.3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3.5

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**9.3**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: I295 Lighting

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	3		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			3

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			1.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7	5.2	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**9.5**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: I295 Paving

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	3	
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		3

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		1.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7	5.2

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**9.8**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: I95 Variable Message Signs

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		3	1.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		3	1.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		3

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		5	1.7	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		0		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		5	1.7	3.3

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		5	2.5	
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5		8	2.7	5.2

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**11.5**

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: I95 Toll Booth and Intersection with SR1

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	3		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			4.5

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	2	.7		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	1.7	2.3	

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	5	2.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7	5.2	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

12

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: SR 273 and OBP, Christiana Corner Connector

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

Factor # 1: Safety

- High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions
- Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety

Factor # 2: Mobility

- Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds
- Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed

Factor #3: Transit

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities

Factor #4: Bike

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement
- Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections

Factor #5: Pedestrian

- Location – Type of Investment Area Designation
- Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections
- Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected

Rating Factors						Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	4		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	11	3.7	9.2	

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities

- Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans
- Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W
- Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic

Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts

- Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized
- Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”
- Summary of Location & Environmental impacts

Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts

- Freight Mobility – Commercial issues
- Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues
- Economic Benefits

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0			
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	6	2		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	3	

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

Factor # 9: Sustainability

- Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required
- Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project

Factor # 10: Mitigation

- Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans
- Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion
- Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion

+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	4		
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5				
+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	5	

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)

17.2

PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – PROJECT WORKSHEET “RATING FACTORS FOR SELECTING CIP PROJECTS”

Project Name: Rehoboth Avenue Improvements

Long Range Plan Goal #1: “Provide a Safe Transportation System Supplying Access & Mobility that Sustains or Improves 1996 Levels”

	Rating Factors					Total Points	Avg Points	Points Subtotal
<u>Factor # 1: Safety</u>								
High Accident Locations – Severity of Existing Conditions	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Project Scope – Extent or Comprehensiveness of Project on Safety	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1.5	
<u>Factor # 2: Mobility</u>								
Travel Flow – Degree to Which Traffic Travels at Near Posted Speeds	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Management – Extent Access Management Policy Addressed	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	4	
<u>Factor #3: Transit</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Service Level – Number & Variety of Transit and Support Amenities	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	10	5	
<u>Factor #4: Bike</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Type – Type of Bikeway Improvement	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access/Connections – Extent of Bike Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	13	4.3	
<u>Factor #5: Pedestrian</u>								
Location – Type of Investment Area Designation	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Effective Length – Extent of Pedestrian Connections	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Access Connections – Types of Land Uses Interconnected	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	13	4.3	19.2

Long Range Plan Goal #2: “Support the State’s Economic Well-Being While Remaining Sensitive to Environmental Needs and Issues.”

<u>Factor # 6: Support for Existing Communities</u>								
Plan consistency – State, County, MPO, Local Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Right of Way – Existing vs. New R/W	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Traffic Volumes – Increase vs. Decrease of Traffic	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	8	2.7	
<u>Factor #7: Other Community/Environmental Impacts</u>								
Right of Way Category – Type of R/W Utilized	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Travel Patterns – Diversion of “Thru Traffic”	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Summary of Location & Environmental impacts	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	
<u>Factor # 8: Other Economic Impacts</u>								
Freight Mobility – Commercial issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Passenger Mobility – Commuter issues	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Economic Benefits	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	0		3.7

Long Range Plan #3: “Achieve Efficiency in Operation and Improvements on the Transportation System.”

<u>Factor # 9: Sustainability</u>								
Project Duration – Years Before Additional Investment Required	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intermodal Support – Number of Modes Access by Project	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	10	5	
<u>Factor # 10: Mitigation</u>								
Project Source – Consistent with Other Plans	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Intersection Level of service – Locational (“Hot Spot”) Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5			
Corridor Delay – Corridor or Areawide Congestion	+5	+3	0	-3	-5	3	1	6

TOTAL POINTS (Goal #1 + Goal #2 + Goal #3)**28.8**